



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Mr. Rowland's comments relative to the extent of state archives may likewise prove of considerable general interest. The territorial archives from 1798 to 1817 are relatively complete. Beginning with the latter date, however, the gaps are many, especially in the period from 1817 to 1839. From the latter date to 1861 the records are fairly complete and even in the Civil War period there seems to have been no very great loss. Again, the records of the period from 1868 to 1895 were not properly preserved.

The guide to the historical materials, which forms the appendix to the volume, is a chronological list of volumes of documents, arranged by periods, such as that of the English dominion or of the territorial government, and by departments, such as governors' records and auditors' records. The volumes for each period, department, or series are numbered independently, and include dates and a brief statement of contents.

C. E. C.

*The Winning of the Far West.* A History of the Regaining of Texas, of the Mexican War, of the Oregon Question, and of the Successive Additions to the Territory of the United States within the Continent of America, 1829-1867. By Robert McNutt McElroy. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914. 384 p. \$2.50 net)

This book "was written . . . to constitute a continuation of Mr. Roosevelt's *Winning of the West*. For the views expressed in the volume, Mr. Roosevelt is, however," we are naïvely informed, "in no way responsible." More than one-third of the 367 pages of text is consumed in sketching the campaigns and battles of the Mexican War. Of the remaining 240 pages, 85 are devoted to the acquisition of Texas, 43 to the Oregon question, 25 to the occupation of New Mexico and California, 35 to the compromise of 1850, 18 to the purchase of Alaska, 19 to the declaration of war against Mexico, and 15 to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. For the past dozen years the theme of the volume has furnished one of the most active and fruitful fields of investigation in American history. Just one thing might barely excuse — though it would hardly justify — a serious historian in ignoring the very substantial product of recent laborers in this field; that would be a more complete presentation of the subject than they have made, based at least on all the sources known to them, or rejecting those sources for cause. Mr. McElroy has not this excuse. Garrison, Reeves, Adams, Smith, Rives, Schafer, Meany and others have presented different phases of the subject with a completeness, and a comprehensiveness of research which his book does not approach; and they differ in essential particulars from some of his conclusions. Mr. Garrison, moreover, except for the disproportion-

ate treatment of the Mexican War and the chapter on Alaska, has covered the same topics in a single scholarly volume of *The American Nation*.

Some twenty-five citations to manuscripts, chiefly letters in the Lenox Library, written by Andrew Jackson in 1843 and 1844 on the Texas question, support the statement in the preface that the book is based in part on unpublished sources; but acquaintance with the first chapter of Smith's *Annexation of Texas* would inform the author that they have not heretofore altogether "escaped the notice of inquisitive historical investigators" (p. 2). The important material on the same subject in the Jackson, Van Buren, and state department manuscripts at Washington, to say nothing of that at London and Mexico, recently exploited by Adams, Smith, and Rives, is not considered. The printed sources used are neither exhaustive nor in some cases, authoritative.

What the author apparently considers his most important contribution is the discovery that Jackson became convinced in 1829 that John Quincy Adams exacted less than Spain was willing to yield in the settlement of the Louisiana-Texas boundary, and much less than the United States was entitled to by the Louisiana purchase, which Jackson thought extended to the Rio Grande. This enables the writer to discard "the once accepted view that Jackson formed and Houston executed a plan for stealing Texas in order to add strength to the slave section of the American nation." "It is quite another story," he thinks, when we learn that they were patriotically intriguing "to redeem for the nation an imperial domain which they believed to have been alienated, secretly and for sectional purposes" (p. 2). This discovery of Jackson's views on the Sabine boundary will cause no surprise to students of the period, for they were common knowledge long before Jackson wrote the letter here cited (March 22, 1844). Nor will the motive of his intriguing seem material. The question which concerns the fair fame of the United States is whether the chief executive of the nation did conspire to deprive Mexico by underhanded methods of the territory legally confirmed to Spain by the treaty of 1819. It is a plausible theory that Houston went to Texas in 1832 with vague plans of despoiling Mexico; but that Jackson was a party to his plans there is no evidence, except the warm friendship between the two. There is very conclusive evidence, however, that Houston had no part in starting the Texas revolution,<sup>1</sup> that Jackson scrupulously refused to sanction corrupt methods in his efforts to buy Texas; and that Jackson made every reasonable effort, I am inclined to think, to enforce the neu-

<sup>1</sup> See an article by the reviewer entitled, "President Jackson and the Texas Revolution," in *American Historical Review*, 12:802, 803; also, J. H. Smith, *Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1911), 25-28.

trality of the United States after the revolution began. Some of the documents, particularly on this last point, are subject to interpretation; and earnest students will continue to differ in the conclusions which they draw from them. Mr. McElroy, however, ignores both the documents and the historians who have used them, so that an uninformed reader might not even suspect their existence. Adams's distorted version (p. 15) of Livingston's instructions to Butler, of March 20, 1833, supports the assumption of crooked dealing in the negotiation for Texas; but the original instructions in the state department, and much other material there and in the Jackson manuscripts, put the matter in a different light. There is no record of Jackson's instructions to Morfit, his special agent to Texas in 1836, but the author asserts (pp. 35, 45) that he was sent to gather information "indicating" that the condition of the country justified recognition. If that is true, he defied his instructions and reported unfavorably. Stranger still, at first blush, Jackson transmitted his opinion to Congress and advised delay. This, however, according to the divination of the author was merely his Machiavellian way of assuring speedy recognition and obliging Houston, who had written begging him to interpose in behalf of Texas; for, lulled to a false security by the message, and believing the president opposed to recognition, the "Anti-annexationists" voted an appropriation for the salary of a diplomatic agent to Texas, whenever the president should deem it wise to send one! (For this train of logic, see pp. 45-52.) A good deal is made of Jackson's refrain of 1843 and 1844, that "we must regain Texas, *peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must*"; but it does not appear to be clearly perceived that there was then no question of Texas' independence, or that to Jackson's mind the force which he was prepared to urge would probably be needed against England rather than against Mexico.

That part of the "anonymous" *Life of Houston* — cited as "the only authentic memoir" — which exercises such a potent influence on the first three chapters of the book, was written under Houston's own supervision in 1845, and a very rudimentary acquaintance with Houston should be sufficient to suggest the need of caution in using it. On its authority, however, Mr. McElroy mounts his heroes on "war horses" (p. 22) and "panting chargers" "flecked with foam" (p. 27), interpolates imaginative speeches and melodramatic scenes (pp. 22, 25, 27, 84, etc.), and credits Houston with the gift of prophecy (p. 28), apparently without reflecting that the prediction was recorded ten years after the event. The silly story of Jackson, with his finger on the map of Texas, declaring that Houston would fight at San Jacinto if he was worth a "bawbee" (pp. 25, 26) arouses no scepticism, though it was a sudden caprice of Santa Anna's and not the strategy of Houston that directed the cam-

paign to that spot. The powerful speech ascribed to Houston on page 22 was not made by him. On the same page the author cites Gammel's *Laws of Texas*; a reference to the journal of the convention of 1836 in this volume (p. 847) would have given him the facts. The treaty of Velasco (p. 28) did not provide that indemnity should be paid the Texas revolutionists, or that "Texas, with a boundary extending to the Rio Grande," should "be acknowledged as a free and independent State."

The limits assigned to this review forbid further discussion. In addition to the points noted above, and aside from possible misprints, inaccuracies of some consequence appear as follows in the first thirty-five pages: one on pages 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 32; two on page 18; three on pages 20 and 23; six on page 17. The misprints in these and other pages, some of which occur consistently are: San Filipe for San Felipe, Nueces for Neches (a matter of importance), Iron for Irion, Cones for Coues, Provost for Prevost, Bustamente for Bustamante, Comargo for Camargo, Meier for Mier, Los Angelos for Los Angeles. Verbal and grammatical ambiguities are not infrequent, but two examples must suffice: the description of the Alamo (pp. 19, 20) leaves one uncertain whether it was a building, a wall, or an inclosed area, and on page 315 (lines 2-5) one finds the curious statement that the Missouri compromise was not adopted by an act of Congress.

France asserted no claims to Oregon (p. 87), and Greenhow (*Oregon and California*, 102, 103), cited for the statement, does not say that she did. Ferrelo probably did not reach the forty-third parallel (p. 88). The statement of the British argument on the Nootka question is incomplete and misleading (p. 113). British designs on California, in the light of recent studies, seem unfairly stated (p. 178). Contrary to the author's estimate (p. 256), investigators are now inclined to the opinion that Polk was eminently equal to his position. And despite the hope aroused by note 1, page 261, Chase's *History of the Polk Administration*, 219-220, does not settle one of the minor puzzles of the Mexican War by revealing the details of the reconciliation of Scott and Trist.

EUGENE C. BARKER

*Kit Carson Days, 1809-1868.* By Edwin L. Sabin. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Company, 1914. 669 p. \$3.00)

Mr. Sabin in this interesting account of the winning of the great far West for American settlement has made a real contribution to the history of that section of the United States. Of the nature of the work attempted the author informs the reader in the beginning that "the story of Kit Carson days is the story of beaver and of Indians; of mountain, canyon, valley, desert and stream ransacked through and through by the fur hunter"; of the trapper followed in rapid succession by trader,